

ym



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/760,883	01/17/2001	Hiroynki Shibata	23.1093	4981
21171	7590	01/12/2005		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER KOVALICK, VINCENT E	
			ART UNIT 2673	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/760,883

Applicant(s)

SHIBATA ET AL.

Examiner

Vincent E Kovalick

Art Unit

2673

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6, 7, 9-11, 13-16, 18-20, 22-24, 26-29 and 31-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 7, 9, 11, 20, 24, 40 and 48-52 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 5, 10, 13-15, 18, 19, 22, 23, 26-28, 30, 31 and 41-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 16 and 29 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Withdrawal of Final Rejection

This Office Action is in response to Applicant's Request, dated November 12, 2004, for withdrawal of USPTO Final Office Action dated July 28, 2004.

Applicant's argument/remarks indicating that the 112 rejection of claims 3, 7, 11, 16, 20, 24, 29 and 48-52 is premature has merit in that on further review and in consideration of Applicant's remarks, it is deemed correct that the specification sufficiently supports the limitation for the driving method for a plasma display wherein "the frequency of the clock signal used to drive the display panel continuously varies within a range of plus or minus 1 percent of a reference frequency" is sufficiently supported in the specification.

Based on this finding, the said USPTO Final Office Action dated July 28, 2004 is herewith withdrawn and a new action is as set forth hereinbelow.

In that new prior art has been introduced in the rejection of claims 1, 10, 14, 19, 23, 27, 34, 35, 36, 38 and 39; Applicant's remarks relative to said claims are rendered moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2673

5. Claims 1-2, 10, 14-15, 19, 23, 27-28, 34-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami (USP 6,037,917).

Relative to claims 1, 10, 14, 19, 23, 27, 34-39 Kawakami **teaches** a plasma display system (col. 2, lines 29-67, col. 3, lines 1-67 and col. 4, lines 1-67); Kawakami further **teaches** a driving method for a plasma display apparatus, wherein a frequency of a clock signal, used to drive a display panel, is continuously varied, and said display panel is driven with said frequency varying clock signal (col. 5, lines 34-37 and lines 60-67).

The difference between the teachings of the instant invention and that of the Kawakami reference is that the instant invention is directed to the reduction of peak values of the display noise by varying the display panel driving frequency wherein the Kawakami reference provides a plasma display capable of reducing the light intensity level variation when a video signal at a different field frequency is inputted.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the limitations as set forth in claims 1, 10, 14, 19, 23, 27 and 34-39 are addressed in the teachings of Kawakami.

Regarding claims 2, 15 and 28, Kawakami **teaches** the driving method for a display apparatus wherein the clock signal used to drive said display panel is a source clock signal of said display apparatus (col. 5, lines 47-67 and col. 6, lines 1-18).

6. Claims 5, 13, 18, 22, 26 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami as applied to claims 1, 6, 10, 14, 19 and 23 respectively in item 5 hereinabove, and further in view of Tanaka et al (USP 6,130,420). Regarding claims 5, 9, 13, 18, 22, 26 and

Art Unit: 2673

31, Kawakami **does not teach** said display apparatus wherein during a quiescent period, said clock generating circuit performs control of said clock used for driving said display panel.

Kawakami teaches a plasma display system.

Tanaka et al. **teaches** an image sensing apparatus and a method for driving said apparatus (col. 1, lines 63-67, col. 2; lines 1-67 and col. 3, lines 1-18). Tanaka et al. further **teaches** said display apparatus wherein during a quiescent period, said clock generating circuit performs control of said clock used for driving said display panel (col. 2, lines 31-67 and col. 3, lines 1-2).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Kawakami, the feature as taught by Tanaka et al. in order to permit the clock generating circuit to exercise control of the clock used for driving the display panel only during a quiescent period so as to not interfere with other functions being performed relative to the display panel during the non-quiescent periods.

7. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami as applied to claim 27 in item 5 hereinabove, and further in view of Nakata et al. (USP 5,206,729).

Relative to claim 32, Kawakami **does not teach** said driving method for a display apparatus wherein said driving of the display panel reduces peak values of noise emitted by the display panel.

Kawakami teaches a plasma display system.

Nakata et al. **teaches** an image switching apparatus for producing special video effects (col. 3, lines 41-68 and col. 4, lines 1-34); Nakata et al. further **teaches** said driving method for a display apparatus wherein said driving of the display panel reduces peak values of noise emitted by the display panel (col. 9, lines 6-11 and Fig. 5).

Art Unit: 2673

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Kawakami the feature as taught by Nakata et al. in order to provide the means to control image flicker (col. 9, lines 3-5, Nakata et al.).

8. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami as applied to claim 27 in item 5 hereinabove, and further in view of Cooper (USP 4,305,091).

Regarding claim 33, Kawakami **does not teach** said driving method for a display apparatus wherein said driving of the display panel spreads out frequencies of noise emitted by the display panel.

Kawakami teaches a plasma display system.

Cooper **teaches** an electronic noise reducing apparatus and method (col. 1, lines 5-33);

Cooper further **teaches teach** said driving method for a display apparatus wherein said driving of the display panel spreads out frequencies of noise emitted by the display panel (col. 9, lines 17-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Kawakami the feature as taught by Cooper in order to minimize the noise emitted by the display panel.

9. Claims 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami as applied to claims 10, 19, 23, 34, 35 and 38, respectively (with both claims 43 and 47 being applied to claim 23) in item 5 hereinabove, and further in view of Jagdt (DE 4112672A1)

Regarding claims 41-47, Kawakami **does not teach** a display apparatus wherein the clock signal time switched between said at least two frequencies in accordance with the time conditions is

periodically time switched between said at least two frequencies to reduce the peak noise output of the display panel

Kawakami teaches a plasma display system.

Jugdt **teaches** a display apparatus wherein the clock signal time switched between said at least two frequencies in accordance with the time conditions is periodically time switched between said at least two frequencies to reduce the peak noise output of the display panel (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Kawakami the feature as taught by Jagdt in order to reduce the noise output of the display panel.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 3, 16 and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Relative to claims 3, 16 and 29, the major difference between the teachings of the prior art of record (USP 6,037,917, Kawakami and USP 6,130,420, Tanaka et al.) and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** the driving method for a plasma display apparatus wherein the frequency of the clock signal used to drive a display panel continuously varies within a range of plus or minus 1 percent of a reference frequency.

11. Claims 6, 7, 9, 11, 20, 24, 40 and 48-52 are allowed.

12. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Relative to claims 6, 7, 11, 20, 24 and 48-52 the major difference between the teachings of the said prior art of record and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not** teach a driving method for a plasma display apparatus having a display panel, wherein a peak

Art Unit: 2673

noise output of the display panel is reduced by switching a clock signal, used to drive the display panel, between at least two frequencies in accordance with time conditions.

Regarding claims 7, 11, 20, 24, and 48-52, the major difference between the teachings of the said prior art of record and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** the driving method for a plasma display apparatus wherein the frequency of the clock signal used to drive a display panel continuously varies within a range of plus or minus 1 percent of a reference frequency.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U. S. Patent No.	5,917,461	Sakami et al.
U. S. Patent No.	5,748,165	Kubota et al.
U. S. Patent No.	3,889,225	McKenzie et al.

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2673


however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Responses

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vincent E Kovalick whose telephone number is 703 306-3020. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30- 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on 703 305-4938. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Vincent E. Kovalick
January 3, 2005